


Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07/05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 1-74168	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.53(a)(2)] <i>transmitted to the USPTO</i> on <u>August 15, 2006</u> Signature <u>Susan D. Romans</u> Typed or printed name <u>Susan D. Romans</u>		Application Number 10/731,244	Filed December 9, 2003
		First Named Inventor Glenn A. Cowelchuk et al.	
		Art Unit 1732	Examiner Jeffery M. Wollschlager
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the <input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>56,117</u> <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____		 Signature <u>Gregory W. Robinette</u> Typed or printed name <u>419-255-5900</u> Telephone number <u>August 15, 2006</u> Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PATENTCERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to
the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Susan D. Romans
(signature)

SUSAN D. ROMANS
(name of person signing certificate)

Date: 8-15-06 No. of Pages: 3

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	Confirmation No.: 4873
Glenn A. COWELCHUK et al.)	
)	Group Art Unit: 1732
Serial No.: 10/731,244)	
)	Examiner: Jeffery M. Wollschlager
Filed: December 9, 2003)	
)	Attorney Docket: 1-74168
For: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING)	
AN AIRBAG ASSEMBLY AND)	
VEHICLE TRIM COMPONENT)	

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Honorable Sir:

Pre-appeal brief review of the Final Rejection of the Examiner, dated May 15, 2006, in the above-identified application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

REMARKS

The Final Rejection contains clear errors in that claimed limitations are clearly not met by the cited references.

(1) Claim 34. The Gallagher et al. and Kieltyka et al. references, individually or when combined, fail to show or suggest simultaneously over-molding an outer layer

Serial No.: 10/731,244

on the first surface of the substrate, and a hinge on the second surface of the substrate,
as recited in Claim 34.

As clearly stated by the Examiner in paragraph 6 of the Office Action dated May 15, 2006, the Gallagher et al. reference does not teach simultaneously over-molding an outer layer on the first surface of the substrate, and a hinge on the second surface of the substrate.

As explained on page 1, first paragraph and continuing through the first full paragraph on page 2 in the Request for Reconsideration filed July 10, 2006, the Kieltyka et al. reference teaches only a method of attaching a thermoplastic attachment to one side of a substrate. Specifically, the Kieltyka et al. reference only teaches compression molding the upper surface (28) of the substrate (26) (to thereby form the substrate into a desired shape) and injection molding an attachment surface (20) on the lower surface (30) (see paragraph 18). Accordingly, the Kieltyka et al. reference teaches away from the limitation recited in Claim 34.

Further, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner incorrectly asserts that the Gallagher et al. reference teaches all of the limitations of Claim 34, and specifically refers to column 11, lines 45 through 65 and Fig. 8 to support his assertion. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, the Gallagher et al. reference discloses a mold having a cavity having the shape of the single integral and unitary panel (100a-c, 14a-c). The integral and unitary panel comprises the instrument panel (100a-c) and the door panel (14a-c) (column 9, line 66 through column 10, line 3). The hinge panel (51a-c) is formed separately (column 4, lines 24 and 25) and placed in the mold cavity. Molten plastic is introduced into the single cavity of the mold and becomes molded to the hinge panel (51a) (column 11, lines 30 through 65).

(2) Claim 48. The Gallagher et al. reference fails to show or suggest placing a substrate defining an airbag door into the mold cavity to define first and second cavities, as recited in Claim 48.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY


Serial No.: 10/731,244

As explained on page 2, second full paragraph and continuing to page 3 in the Request for Reconsideration filed July 10, 2006, the Gallagher et al. reference teaches a single "tethering layer defining cavity (74)" (see column 8, lines 52 through 57 and Fig. 6), and therefore does not show or suggest placing a substrate defining an airbag door into the mold cavity to define first and second cavities.

In further contrast to the Examiner's assertion, the Gallagher et al. reference discloses only mold assemblies with single cavities. In addition to the cavity (74) discussed above, the substrate is formed in a first mold assembly comprising the mold tool (70) and another "back side" mold tool (not shown). The mold assembly defines only a substrate cavity. After forming the substrate, the "back side" mold tool is moved and replaced with the injection mold tool (72). The mold tool (70) and the injection mold tool (72) define a second mold assembly having only a tethering layer defining cavity (74) that defines the entirety of the tethering layer shape (column 8, lines 28 through 57).

In view of the reasons presented above, Claims 34 through 51 are in condition ~~for allowance.~~

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory W. Robinette
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 56,117

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900